



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,097	10/17/2003	Glenn C. Godoy	END920030047US1	9088

23550 7590 03/21/2007
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC
75 STATE STREET
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

PONIKIEWSKI, TOMASZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/688,097	Applicant(s) GODOY ET AL.	
	Examiner Tomasz Ponikiewski	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/05/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4-December-2006 has been entered.

2. The Amendment filed on March 7, 2007 has been received and entered. Claims 1-20 are pending.

3. The amendment overcomes rejections under 101.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

5. Claim 14 recites the word "for" in the body of the claim. The word could be changed to recite "to". The limitations following the phrase "for" describes only intended use but not necessarily required functionality of the claim. Limitations following the phrase "for" do not carry patentable weight, which cause the claims to appear as a

Art Unit: 2165

series of non-functional descriptive material/data without any functional relation with each other. Applicant is required to amend the claims so that the claim limitations are recited in a definite form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-6, 9, 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishimura (US 2001/0051904 A1).

As per claim 1 Nishimura is directed to a method of managing custom data by computer during an electronic purchase, the method comprising:

selecting an item for purchase (page 5, paragraph 0073) ;

determining a set of attributes for the item, wherein the attributes include item-based attributes and purchase-based attributes (page 4, paragraph 0062);

comparing the set of attributes to a set of keys, wherein each key is generated based on data collected on a custom data form and wherein each key includes an attribute with a corresponding matching value (page 5, paragraph 0078, lines 11-15, wherein the “keys” could mean the choices available for customization; page 6,

Art Unit: 2165

paragraph 0085, lines 1-7; page 6, paragraph 0086, wherein the key is made up of attribute such as a name "cpu" and value such as "xxxx-650 Mhz"); and

displaying the custom data form using the computer in the case that the set of attributes matches the set of keys (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9).

As per claim 2 Nishimura is directed to the selecting step comprises:

adding the item to an electronic shopping cart (page 7, paragraph 0101, wherein item is added to cart after the selects the item);

selecting to checkout the electronic shopping cart (page 7, paragraph 0102, lines 7-10, wherein the client determines whether the item appears to be the one selected);

and obtaining purchase information for the electronic purchase (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 5-6).

As per claim 3 Nishimura is directed to wherein the custom data form is displayed after the obtaining step (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9).

As per claim 4 Nishimura is directed to comprising generating the custom data form for the item (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9).

As per claim 5 Nishimura is directed to comprising obtaining custom data using the custom data form (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9).

Art Unit: 2165

As per claim 6 Nishimura is directed to comprising storing the obtained custom data in a database (page 4, paragraph 0063, lines 8-12, wherein custom data can mean any information about the product).

As per claim 9, Nishimura is directed to the custom data form is displayed once for a plurality of items that match the set of keys (figure 9, wherein the form is displayed matching the selected data).

As per claim 14 Nishimura is directed to a system for managing custom data by a computer during an electronic purchase, the system comprising:

- a selection system for allowing a user to select an item for purchase (page 5, paragraph 0073);

- an attribute system for determining a set of attributes for the item, wherein the attributes include item-based attributes and purchase-based attributes (page 4, paragraph 0062);

- a key system for comparing the set of attributes to a set of keys wherein each key is generated based on data collected on a custom data form and wherein each key includes an attribute with a corresponding matching value (page 5, paragraph 0078, lines 11-15, wherein the “keys” could mean the choices available for customization; page 6, paragraph 0085, lines 1-7; page 6, paragraph 0086, wherein the key is made up of attribute such as a name “cpu” and value such as “xxxx-650 Mhz”);and

a form system for displaying the custom data form using the computer in the case that the set of attributes matches the set of keys (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9).

As per claim 15 Nishimura is directed to comprising a checkout system to obtain purchase information for the item (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 5-6).

As per claim 16 Nishimura is directed to comprising a storage system to store custom data, wherein the form system further obtains the custom data using the custom data form (page 4, paragraph 0063, lines 8-12, wherein custom data can mean any information about the product).

As per claim 18 Nishimura is directed to a computer program product stored on a recordable medium for managing custom data during an electronic purchase, which when executed by a computer comprises:

program code to allow a user to select an item for purchase (page 5, paragraph 0073);

program code to determine a set of attributes for the items, wherein the attributes include item-based attributes and purchase-based attributes (page 4, paragraph 0062);

program code to compare the set of attributes to a set of keys wherein each key is generated based on data collected on a custom data form and wherein each key includes an attribute with a corresponding matching value (page 5, paragraph 0078,

Art Unit: 2165

lines 11-15, wherein the "keys" could mean the choices available for customization; page 6, paragraph 0085, lines 1-7; page 6, paragraph 0086, wherein the key is made up of attribute such as a name "cpu" and value such as "xxxx-650 Mhz"); and

program code to display the custom data form using the computer in the case that the set of attributes matches the set of keys (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US 2001/0051904 A1) in view of Leber et al. (US 2003/0182391 A1).

As per claim 7 Nishimura does not teach concatenating custom data obtained using at least two input fields in the custom data form.

Leber et al. does teach concatenating custom data obtained using at least two input fields in the custom data form (Leber et al., figure. 2b, 288).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura by teachings of Leber et al. to include

Art Unit: 2165

concatenating custom data obtained using at least two input fields in the custom data form because doing so keeps all the relevant data together.

Nishimura as modified still does not teach storing the concatenated custom data as a large object in the database.

Leber et al. does teach storing the concatenated custom data as a large object in the database (Leber et al., page 4, paragraph 0067, lines 7-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura as modified by teachings of Leber et al. to include saving the information in a database because it is more efficient to store the data in a repository that is easily accessed.

As per claim 8 Nishimura as modified still does not teach comprising parsing the concatenated custom data to determine the custom data obtained for one of the at least two fields.

Leber et al. does teach comprising parsing the concatenated custom data to determine the custom data obtained for one of the at least two fields (Leber et al. page 4, paragraph 0067, lines 2-4, wherein "concatenated custom data" could mean "message"; figure. 2b, 288).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura as modified by teachings of Leber et al. to include parsing the concatenated custom data because the data would only make sense it placed in proper format.

10. Claims 10, 12-13, 17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US 2001/0051904 A1) in view of Christensen et al. (US 2002/0154114 A1).

As per claim 10 Nishimura is directed to a method of managing custom data by a computer during an electronic purchase, the method comprising:

selecting an item for purchase (page 5, paragraph 0073);

obtaining purchase information for the item (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 5-6);

determining a set of attributes for the item, wherein the attributes include item-based attributes and purchase-based attributes (page 4, paragraph 0062);

comparing the set of attributes to a set of keys wherein each key is generated based on data collected on a custom data form and wherein each key includes an attribute with a corresponding matching value (page 5, paragraph 0078, lines 11-15, wherein the "keys" could mean the choices available for customization; page 6, paragraph 0085, lines 1-7; page 6, paragraph 0086, wherein the key is made up of attribute such as a name "cpu" and value such as "xxxx-650 Mhz");

displaying the custom data form using the computer in the case that the set of attributes matches the set of keys (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9);

obtaining custom data using at least one input field in the custom data form (paragraph 0031, lines 4-7).

Nishimura as modified still does not teach storing the obtained custom data and purchase information in a database.

Christensen et al. does teach and storing the obtained custom data and purchase information in a database (Christensen et al., page 5, paragraph 0049, lines 48-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura as modified by teachings of Christensen et al. to include saving the information in a database because it is more efficient to store the information about item and purchase data together for good recordkeeping.

As per claim 12 Nishimura as modified is directed to the storing step further comprises storing an entry in a custom data group table for a custom data group, wherein the custom data group includes each item in the electronic purchase that matches the set of keys (Nishimura, figure 2 shows table with various keys).

As per claim 13 Nishimura as modified is directed to storing the large object in an entry in a group custom data table in the case that the custom data form is displayed once for the custom data group (Christensen et al., page 5, paragraph 0049, lines 48-51, wherein the database is made up of tables);

and storing the large object in an entry in an item custom data table in the case that the custom data form is displayed for each item in the custom data group

Art Unit: 2165

(Christensen et al., page 5, paragraph 0049, lines 48-51, wherein the database is made up of tables).

As per claim 17 Nishimura is directed to the storage system includes:

a custom data group table to store an entry for a custom data group, wherein the custom data group includes each item in the electronic purchase that matches the set of keys (Nishimura, figure 2 shows table with various keys);

Nishimura does not teach group custom data table to store an entry for the custom data for the custom data group if the custom data form is displayed once for the custom data group.

Christensen et al. does teach group custom data table to store an entry for the custom data for the custom data group if the custom data form is displayed once for the custom data group (Christensen et al., page 5, paragraph 0049, lines 48-51, wherein the database is made up of tables).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura by teachings of Christensen et al. to include group custom data table to store an entry for the custom data for the custom data group if the custom data form is displayed once for the custom data group because storing data in tables is convenient and efficient process.

Nishimura as modified still does not teach an item custom data table to store an entry for the custom data for each item in the custom data group if the custom data form is displayed once for each item in the custom data group.

Christensen et al. does teach an item custom data table to store an entry for the custom data for each item in the custom data group if the custom data form is displayed once for each item in the custom data group (Christensen et al., page 5, paragraph 0049, lines 48-51, wherein the database is made up of tables).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura as modified by teachings of Christensen et al. to include an item custom data table to store an entry for the custom data for each item in the custom data group if the custom data form is displayed once for each item in the custom data group because storing data in tables is convenient and efficient process.

As per claim 19 Nishimura is directed to further comprising:

program code to obtain purchase information for the item (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 5-6);

program code to obtain custom data using the custom data form (page 7, paragraph 0103, lines 7-9);

Nishimura does not teach program code to store the custom data and the purchase information.

Christensen et al. teaches program code to store the custom data and the purchase information (Christensen et al., page 5, paragraph 0049, lines 48-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura by teachings of Christensen et al. to

Art Unit: 2165

include saving the information in a database because it is more efficient to store the information about item and purchase data together for good recordkeeping.

As per claim 20 Nishimura as modified is directed to comprising program code to process the custom data (Nishimura, figure 4, s20, wherein processing happens when the purchase is submitted).

11. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura (US 2001/0051904 A1) and Christensen et al. (US 2002/0154114 A1) above, and further in view of Leber et al. (US 2003/0182391 A1).

As per claim 11 Nishimura and Christensen et al. do not teach concatenating custom data obtained for a plurality of input fields.

Leber et al. teaches concatenating custom data obtained for a plurality of input fields (Leber et al., figure. 2b, 288).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura as modified by teachings of Leber et al. to include concatenating of data because doing so keeps all the relevant data together.

Nishimura and Christensen et al. as modified still do not teach storing the concatenated custom data as a large object in the database.

Leber et al. teaches storing the concatenated custom data as a large object in the database (Leber et al., page 4, paragraph 0067, lines 7-8).

Art Unit: 2165

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Nishimura as modified by teachings of Leber et al. to include saving the information in a database because it is more efficient to store the data in a repository that is easily accessed.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 03/07/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's argument that Nishimura does not contain key is found not persuasive. The key is made up of attribute and value corresponding to the attribute. Nishimura shows both on page 6 paragraphs 0085-0086. The attributes are the names of the various specifications, such as "cpu" or "internal hard drive". The second part of the key is value wherein Nishimura represents it by the "XXXX-650 MHz" or "30 GB".

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tomasz Ponikiewski whose telephone number is (571)272-1721. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on (571)272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2165

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tomasz Ponikiewski
March 19, 2006

Meriem Abdel-Jalil
